

Application No. 10/615,401
Amendment Dated June 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 24, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

By the present Amendment, claims 1, 5 – 9, 11 – 14, 17 – 22, 24 – 27 and 33 - 36 are amended, and claim 4 is canceled. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 – 3 and 5 - 37 are currently pending in the application, with claims 1, 16 and 29 being independent.

Applicant has carefully considered the contents of the Office Action and respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of the subject application in view of the explanations noted below.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112(second paragraph)

Claims 7 – 9, 13, 14, 20 – 22, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, these claims recite various “second” members when a “first” member has not been recited.

Claims 5 – 6, 8 – 9, 11 – 14, 17 – 22, 24 – 27 and 33 – 36 have been amended to remove the terms “first” and “second” from the claims when such modification is not warranted (i.e., when there are no claims dependent thereon that recite “second” or “first” members, respectively). Since claim 1 has been amended to include a first magnet, the second magnet recited in dependent claim 7 has proper antecedent basis.

Therefore, such claim amendments overcome the rejection of claims 7 – 9, 13, 14, 20 – 22, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the allowed subject matter of claims 16 – 19, 23 – 25 and 28 - 37. Applicants further appreciate the indicated allowability of claims 20 – 22 and 26 – 27 if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.


Application No. 10/615,401
Amendment Dated June 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 24, 2005

Applicants also appreciate the indicated allowability of objected to claims 4 - 6, which would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Independent claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 4. Therefore, claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 15 are allowable.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendments and comments, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 – 3 and 5 - 37 are in condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marcus R. Mickney
Reg. No. 44,941

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: JUNE 23, 2005